

Federick Hays Lee

CONSIDERATIONS
UPON THE
PRESENCE OF NON-COMMUNICANTS
AT THE
HOLY COMMUNION.

1. 1000 100

1000 100

1000 100

THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER
TO BE "DULY USED."

CONSIDERATIONS

UPON THE

PRESENCE OF NON-COMMUNICANTS

AT THE

HOLY COMMUNION.

BY

A LONDON CLERGYMAN.

OXFORD & LONDON :
JOHN HENRY PARKER, 377, STRAND.

PREFACE.

No apology is offered for bringing under the notice of Churchmen the question treated of in the following pages. Recent experience has shown us but too clearly, how a doctrine or practice will first float along,—then settle and collect,—till at last it stands firm, prepared to claim for itself the sanction of age and custom.

It is with deep pain that the writer has observed the practice of attending at Holy Communion without receiving, encouraged by some of the Clergy. One who best defended it, has carried it out to its legitimate conclusion in the Church of Rome. What result is likely to follow with those who are habituated to this perversion of primitive practice, than that they will seek elsewhere for that *perpetual* Presence, to which they have been taught to have recourse, as to a means of grace, *occasionally* among ourselves? and this indeed has unhappily been the case. It cannot for an instant be doubted but that many persons encourage the attendance of Non-Communicants with the best possible intention; they seem, however, to forget that the question is not so much whether the practice might or might not, under other circumstances, be edifying, as whether it is sanctioned by the English

Church—whether the possible advantages to be derived from it, are not more than counter-balanced by its dangerous tendency.

Does it argue much foresight, or any great power of deduction, to introduce practices into the Church of England, which are contrary to the spirit of her teaching, and can only be carried out consistently in Rome? Is it prudent, or right, under existing circumstances, to bridge over the gulf which separates us from her, by introducing in imitation of her the unprimitive innovation of inviting children, as well as older persons, to what the early Church would have regarded as a perversion of the highest act of Christian worship?—a perversion against which S. Chrysostom so loudly inveighs. The late Dr. Mill while he seems to have thought that persons might not be desired to withdraw—for which opinion, however, he can quote no earlier authorities than Balsamon and Zonaras, who wrote in the twelfth century—still says, “I should be strongly opposed, under our present circumstances, to *inviting* their presence as non-communicants.”¹ And of the said authorities, Johnson, in his Notes on the Apostolical Canons, remarks, “both Balsamon and Zonaras are willing to make the Canon speak the *sense of their own degenerate age*, viz.:—that it was *sufficient for men to stay* in the Church, not necessary to partake of the Communion.”²

¹ Tracts on Catholic Unity, No. vii.

Apostolical Canons, Oxf. Ed. Johnson, p. 32.

Some stress has been laid on a Canon ordering those to be excommunicated who should not receive for three successive Sundays; whence it is assumed that those who did not receive, were present at the *celebration* on the two intervening ones, of which there is no proof whatever. The Coronation Service has also been appealed to in support of this view, but we can hardly quote a State pageant as proving a doctrine, any more than a question of ritual, when it orders copes, and not chasubles and tunics to be worn by the Celebrant and his assistants; but in point of fact, the Service was left untouched at the Reformation, and remains very nearly as it was in Popish times; and though a very good evidence of practice then, is none at all of the mind of the Church now. It is a most striking symptom of the state of morality among us—as it is one chief cause of our miserable distractions, heart-burnings, and jealousies,—that while so few are willing to gather their teaching out of the Prayer Book, so many unite in distorting it to sanction their own preconceived views. Men care not to speak with the accents of the Church, but too often she is made to teach Roman error under the name of “Catholic truth,” or the doctrines of dissent, as “Bible Christianity.” So the plainest language is swept away by the side-wind of a “charitable hypothesis,” or sapped by a system of casuistry and “non-natural” interpretation:—and this by men who have declared before God, at perhaps the most solemn moment of their lives, that they *ex animo* assented to

the Articles and Liturgy. One section, in their search after "truth," think they discover it in Puritanism, another in Popery;—neither seem to reflect that when once they cease to concur in the *antagonism* of the Church of England towards both the one and the other, they can no longer honestly continue to occupy a position which was committed to them on *that express condition*. It does not seem too much to expect that men should have satisfied themselves as to "what is truth," before they vowed "by the help of the LORD *always so to administer Doctrine, as this Church and Realm hath received the same.*" Never will "Church principles" make way among the mass of the people, while any of their professors are obnoxious to a charge which is alike repugnant to the national character, and destructive of all confidence in them,—while any inculcate doctrines and practices which common sense shows to be opposed both to the spirit and teaching of the Reformed Church,—and then, after a disheartening amount of fruitless labour in her unkindly soil, pass over one by one to a more genial "part of the vineyard," openly to assist in the propagation of error, "not only in living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."¹

Far otherwise used those to act, who, in days gone by, best loved the Church of England, and suffered for "Church principles" the most. It is related of

¹ Art. xix.

good Bishop Ken, that "he did not shrink from faithfully explaining and enforcing the doctrines of the English Church as distinguished from the errors of Rome;"¹ and in his famous Whitehall Sermon he says—"I earnestly exhort you to a uniform zeal for the REFORMATION."² Now-a-days men start back from the echo of their own voices, when the aforesaid "errors" are to be denounced; it is deemed a want of charity to notice the false teaching of "our elder sister,"—yet S. Paul lacked not charity when he withstood S. Peter to the face, "because he was to be blamed." He lacked not charity, but he loved the *truth*,—and he knew what the truth was, and he feared not boldly to proclaim it. Is it want of certainty, or of courage, that makes men act so differently now?

There can be no question but that the practice in early times was for every one not undergoing penance, to *receive* as often as there was a celebration. As those who were present received, so did those who were unwilling to receive, go out before the celebration; and we find S. Chrysostom complaining, "I often observe a great multitude flock together to hear the Sermon, but when the time of the Holy Mysteries comes, I can see few or none of them. If you had laid up in your hearts what I preach to you, it would retain you in the Church and prompt you to *receive* the Holy Mysteries with piety and veneration."³ As love waxed colder, Communions became

¹ Life, p. 169. ² *Ibid.* p. 272.

³ Hom. iii. de Incompr. Dei Nat.

less frequent, and at last, by way of compromise, the corruption began to obtain, of persons remaining not to *receive*, but to *gaze*. This practice, founded upon a belief in a Material Presence in the Eucharist, and of which the legitimate and certain development is the Roman "*Benediction*," the English Church condemns in Articles xxv. and xxviii. And yet persons are now taught that there is no reason why because they *do not eat and drink, which our LORD did command*, they should not "*gaze and worship*," which He did *not* command; but that on the contrary, "it is no ground for losing one blessing that we lose another;"¹ thereby separating the sacrifice from the feast, though "it is the former, *simply in order to the latter.*"²

"The *utmost* that can be claimed on the score of antiquity," says one, whose opinion all Churchmen would respect, "is that confirmed persons living under exact discipline, might occasionally be present without communicating;" that is to say, *penitents* were under certain conditions allowed to be present without receiving, *as a mitigation of excommunication*, not voluntary, but imposed by the Church; but this is in every respect a different case from theirs who being able to communicate—"of the Faithful"—choose not to receive themselves, but to stand by as gazers while others do so. Against this practice the Church always protested, as a per-

¹ Tr. on Catholic Unity, No. vii.

² *Ibid.*

version of, and act of irreverence to, the Holy Communion of CHRIST'S Body and Blood. But it is a great question whether even the Penitents above alluded to, were present at the Celebration itself, and did not go out before the oblations were placed on the altar. Bingham seems to imply this when he says, "In the Constitutions, the Deacon is appointed again to make a solemn proclamation, ordering *all non-communicants*, catechumens, *penitents*, and unbelievers to be *excluded* ;"¹ as do the other authorities which have been brought forward.

Mischievous then, and contrary alike to the practice of antiquity, and to the teaching of the English Church, as this practice is, it may, perhaps, be questionable whether it would be well that those who have become habituated to it, should suddenly debar themselves from an aid to their love and devotion, which, while it ought never to have been adopted, cannot be broken off otherwise than gradually without a severe shock to sanctifying and blessed associations ; against which, however, the true remedy will be found in more frequent Communion.

May HE who "giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might increaseth strength," purify us in His good time from all will-worship ; may He knit our hearts more closely to His own with the bands of love, and evermore keep us in His truth, together with the whole Church.

G. R. P.

¹ Eccl. Ant. xv., c. iii. § 6.

In considering the question of the propriety or otherwise, of persons remaining to witness the Holy Communion, without themselves communicating, it will be best to investigate first of all the practice of the Early Church; for what was first is true; whatever is later is common," says Tertullian; let us then see what was the practice of Christians in the earliest times in this respect.

"It is evident that the most ancient and primitive custom was, for all that were allowed to stay and communicate in prayer, to communicate in the participation of the Eucharist also, except only the last class of penitents, who were admitted to hear the prayers, but not to receive the oblation, nor receive the Communion; when, however, the name of Communicantes—'co-muni-cantes'—was used, they might stay to communicate in the Holy Communion, without the oblation, as the author of the *Confession of St. Basil* says. These only, excepted, all other baptized persons were not only permitted, but by the rules of the Church, bound, to communicate in the Eucharist, under pain of ecclesiastical censure. The most ancient canons are very express to this purpose. Among those called the Apostolical Canons, there is one run in these words:—'All such of the Faithful as come to Church and hear the Scriptures read, but stay not the prayers, and to partake of the Holy Communion, ought to be

IN considering the question of the propriety, or otherwise, of persons remaining to witness the Holy Communion, without themselves communicating, it will be best to investigate, first of all, the practice of the Early Church ; for “whatever was first is true ; whatever is later is corrupt,” says Tertullian.¹ Let us then see what was the practice of Christians in the earliest times in this respect.

“ It is evident that the most antient and primitive custom was, for *all* that were allowed to stay and communicate in prayer, to communicate in the *participation* of the Eucharist also ; except only the last class of penitents, who were admitted to hear the prayers, but not to make their oblation, nor receive the Communion ; whence they had the name of *Consistentes*—‘co-standers ;’ because they might stay to communicate in the prayers, but still ‘without the oblation,’ as the antient canons word it. These only excepted, *all other* baptized persons were not only permitted, but, by the rules of the Church, *obliged*, to communicate in the Eucharist, under pain of ecclesiastical censure. The most antient canons are very express to this purpose. Among those called the Apostolical Canons, there is one runs in these words :—‘ All such of the Faithful as come to Church and hear the Scriptures read, but stay not the prayers, and to *partake* of the Holy Communion, ought to be

¹ In *Enchirid Theol.* vol. i. p. 322.

suspended as authors of disorder in the Church.' Which the Council of Antioch repeats, with a little enlargement, 'All such as come into the Church of God and hear the Holy Scriptures read, but do not communicate with the people in prayer, and refuse to *partake* of the Eucharist,—which is a disorderly practice,—ought to be cast out of the Church, till they confess their fault, and bring forth fruits of repentance; when, if they ask pardon, they may obtain it.'² Martin Bracarensis puts this canon into his collection, for the use of the Spanish Church; and Gratian alleges a decree of Pope Anacletus, which orders all to *communicate* when the consecration was ended, if they would not be cast out of the Church, *for so the Apostles appointed*, and the Holy Roman Church observed that order.³ Which, though it be a supposititious decree, yet it is made in conformity with the antient discipline, and shows the practice that was then prevailing, even in the Roman Church. In S. Chrysostom's time, A.D. 347, *some began to desire* they might have liberty to stay during the performance of the whole office, and not be obliged to communicate. They were not willing to be accounted penitents, and be driven out with them; and yet they would not be communicants, and orderly partake with the Church. Against these, S. Chrysostom inveighs after his usual manner, with a great deal of eloquence and becoming sharpness:—'Are you unworthy of the sacrifice, or

¹ Can. Apostol. ix.

² Conc. Antioch, c. ii.

³ Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. ii. cx. Corpus Jur. Can. vol. i. p. 454.

unfit to partake of it, (for that was their plea,) neither then are you worthy of the prayers. Do you not hear the Church's herald standing and proclaiming 'all ye that are penitents withdraw?' All they that do not communicate are penitents. If thou art of the number of penitents thou mayest not partake; for he that is not a partaker is a penitent. Why does he say 'All ye that cannot pray begone?' And why do you impudently stay? You are not one of those, you will say, but of those that may partake. Consider I pray, and seriously weigh the matter. The royal table is prepared—the angels stand ministering by—the LORD Himself is present; and do you stand yawning as an idle spectator only? Your garments are defiled, and are you under no concern? Yea, but say you they are clean; then sit down and partake. The King comes daily to all the guests and discourses with them all; and now he says 'In your consciences friends, how came you to *stand here*, not having on a wedding garment?' He said not, 'Why art thou *set down*?' But, before he was set down, *before he was entered*, He pronounced him unworthy; for He said not 'Why art thou set down?' but 'Why camest thou hither?' The same now He says to every one of us, that stand here with an impudent boldness; for *every one that does not partake* is shameless and impudent. They that are in sin, are for this reason, first cast out. As, therefore, none of those, who are not initiated, ought to be present; so, neither any of those who are initiated, if they be defiled:—tell me, if any one that is invited to a feast washes his hands

and sits down, and is ready for the table, and yet, after all, eats not—does he not affront him that invited him? Were it not better that such a man *should not be present*? Likewise thou also art present; thou hast sung the hymn, and made profession with the rest that thou art one of those that art worthy, in that thou didst not depart with the unworthy. How is it that thou remainest, and yet dost not partake at the table? Thou sayest, ‘I am unworthy.’ Thou art, then, unworthy also of the communion of prayers.’”¹

It is evident from this, that to be present at the Heavenly Feast and not to partake of that Feast, was considered by S. Chrysostom as an affront to Him Who made it; and it is difficult to understand how those who then voluntarily cut themselves off from the communion of their brethren, can join in prayers which ask for grace, “so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son JESUS CHRIST, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood;”—and again, how such can thank God for having “vouchsafed to feed them with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of His Son:” and so the learned Bingham quoting Cardinal Bona, says, “The very tenour of the mass, and the practice of the Antient Church evince that the sacrifice was originally instituted, principally to be publicly and solemnly performed by the clergy and people standing, offering,

¹ Chrysostom Hom. iii. in Ephes. Bingham Eccles. Ant., xv., c. 4.

and *communicating* together, for all the prayers in the very words of the canon, are spoken in the plural number, as in the name of many:—hence it is that the priest, inviting the people to pray, says, ‘let us pray;’ or when he salutes them he says, ‘the LORD be with you.’ And then the people being admonished to lift up their hearts unto God, answer, ‘we lift them up unto the LORD.’ Hence it is that in the very canon, he always prays in the name of the people gathered together, of which giving several instances he infers, that from thence it is clear, that the mass is nothing else but the action of the Priest and the *whole congregation*, which he says is proved further from those words of the prayer, ‘all that stand here, whose faith and devotion is known to Thee,’ which cannot be wrested to any other sense—and that *all that were present* did communicate, he says appears from those words of the Priest when he prays ‘that the Body and Blood of CHRIST may be to all that receive, eternal life;’ and after the Communion, he says, ‘what we have received with our mouths, let us receive with a pure mind;’ and, ‘Thou hast filled Thy family with Thy gifts:’ and almost all the prayers, which are said after communicating, are of the same tenour, because *no others* could be present but such as could offer and *partake* of the Sacrament; which he proves from Cyprian and Pope Leo, and the Apostolical Canons, and the Council of Antioch.”

Justin Martyr, the earliest Christian Apologist, (A.D. 103), describing the administration of the Holy

Communion, says, "The elements being blessed, the deacons give to *every one present* of the consecrated bread and wine."¹ And so L'Estrange, "true it is according to the Primitive rules, *no man* of the faithful might stay behind *and not communicate*, upon pain of excommunication."² And Jewel in his answer, to Harding, who "saith in scorn that we will have all the people that will not receive, to be driven out of the Church," replies, "the antient doctors have both taught, and also practised the same."³

Tertullian calls receiving the Sacrament, the "participation of the sacrifice;"⁴ and he advises the lay Christian who was resolved to keep his station fast, to take the sacrifice and reserve It to be eaten afterwards, rather than not be present at the oblation—a clear proof that in the second century, not only was participation an invariable rule, but that no benefit was supposed to accrue to those who stood by, except they received. "Which (oblations) having been consecrated, are distributed to *all present*—all who had joined in the prayers, and in hearing the Sacred Scriptures—and they *all partook* of them;—so that *no one* went out till he had been fed with this spiritual food."⁵

The first Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) orders those who come to Church, but *neglect to communicate*, to be admonished; and if they amend not upon admonition, then to be reduced to the state of formal penance

¹ Apol. ii. p. 97. ² Alliance of Divine Offices, p. 269.

³ Answer, p. 57. ⁴ De Orat. xiv. p. 135.

⁵ Bp. Bev. Cod. Can., p. 22.

for their crime.¹ This is somewhat different from inviting persons to be present without communicating!

Dionysius "the Areopagite," says, "after the reading of the Old and New Testament, the learners of the Faith before they were baptized, madmen, and they that were joined to penance for their faults, were shut out of the Church, and *they only did remain which did receive.*"²

"After this let the Bishop receive, then the Presbyters, and Deacons, and sub-deacons, and readers, and singers, and ascetics, and of the deaconesses, virgins and widows, afterwards the children, and then *all the people* in order, with fear and reverence."³

"In the Primitive Church, *all* as many as were present at the canon of the mass communicated daily, and if they were unwilling to communicate, they departed after the offertory."⁴ "But it was ordered that the Bishops shall not receive oblations from one who does not *communicate.*"⁵ Since it was "in those days considered a privilege to be allowed to make oblations, and a sort of lesser excommunication to be debarred from it;" and therefore "it was a standing rule among them not to admit the oblations of those, who having a right to communicate, would not stay to *participate* in the communion."⁶

"*All* formerly, both laymen and Priests, communi-

¹ c. xiii.

² Dionys. in Cœlest. Hierar, cap. iii., part 2—3.

³ Rubric at end of Clementine Liturgy.

⁴ Hugo Card. in Luc. c. xxiv.

⁵ Conc. Illiberis, A.D. 300, c. xxviii.

⁶ Bingham Eccl. Ant. xv., c. ii. § 2.

cated together with the Celebrant, as is clearly seen from the Apostolical Canons and from the most antient books of Doctors of the Church.”¹

“You shall understand that the Canons of the Apostles, and divers of the first Bishops of Rome, and other holy Fathers, required that *all such as were present* at the ministration of the Communion, should be *partakers of the Sacrament*; and accounted worthy to be put out of the Church, those who would not communicate with the Minister.”²

“Balsamon calls the former, (the Apostolical Canon relating to the Communion of the Clergy,) a ‘grievous canon;’ and this (relating to the laity, and quoted above,) ‘a very harsh one,’ *upon supposition that they enjoin a participation of the Eucharist to all that come within the Church doors.*”³

And again the learned Thorndike, alluding to the admonition of the Deacon just before the celebration, “you that pray the first prayer depart,” says, “which I take to be this, that *such of the believers* as were present indeed at the Prayers of the Congregation for all states of the Church, *but did not intend to communicate, should also depart.*”⁴ The “first prayer” here alluded to was probably the “first” that concerned the *Faithful*; it begins, “*Domine Omnipotens Altissime,*” and speaks of those for whom it was intended, as “the flock,”—“those who had been redeemed with the precious Blood of CHRIST;” and prays “that they may be

¹ Johannes Cochläus, quoted by Jewel, Def. Apol., 1567, p. 227.

² Bp. Jewel. Sermon on Haggai, i., 2, 3. Edit. 1583.

³ Note on Apostolical Canons. Oxf. Ed., Johnson, p. 32.

⁴ Religious Assemblies, p. 340.

kept without stain of sin in soul and body, that they may be sanctified in the truth, and made fit for eternal life, by Him who is their Defender, Guardian, Wall of Defence," &c. This prayer comes after the dismissal of the catechumens, energumens, and penitents, but after it, and before the oblations were brought to the Bishop, the Deacon proclaimed, "let none remain who has a quarrel with any, or who is a hypocrite," &c., which is perfectly incomprehensible except on the supposition that all who remained after that, were bound to *communicate*; and it is most probable that penitents in their last stage, retired also at that time.¹

Having thus shown what was the practice of the early Church upon this point, we come next to consider the teaching of our own.

At the time of the Reformation, it was undoubtedly the custom for persons to be present at the Holy Communion,—or, as it was then commonly called, "the sacrifice of the mass,"—without receiving. The Reformed Church made every effort to discountenance this. In the first Liturgy of Edward VI., those who did not receive were not allowed to remain with those who did; the Rubric after the Offertory sentences stood thus—"Then so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the choir, or *in some convenient place near the choir*; the men on the one side, the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion) shall depart out of the choir, except the Ministers and Clerks;" and by parity of reasoning, they would be

¹ Apost. Constit. Cf. Bingham, Eccl. Ant. xv. iii. § 4.

excluded from the nave, *i.e.*, from the Church, when the communicants themselves occupied that, as “a convenient place nigh the choir,” in place of the choir itself

In the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. the Church speaks more decidedly still. The Priest in the Exhortation to Communion is made to say—“And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers, and lookers on them that do communicate, and *be no partakers of the same yourselves*. For what thing can this be accounted else, than a further contempt and unkindness unto God. Truly, it is a great unthankfulness to say Nay, when ye be called: *but the fault is much greater when men stand by*, and yet will neither eat nor drink this Holy Communion with other. I pray you what can this be else, but even to have the mysteries of CHRIST in derision? It is said unto *all*, Take ye and eat; Take and drink ye *all* of this: Do this in remembrance of Me. With what face then, or with what countenance, shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising, and mocking of the Testament of CHRIST? Wherefore, rather than you should so do, *depart you hence*, and give place to them that be godly disposed.”

This remained through the subsequent revisions of the Prayer Book, till the last review, when the passage above quoted was omitted, and the exhortation framed as we now have it.

Some persons have thought that the fact of this omission shows that the Church did not intend to continue the exclusion of non-communicants;—but in the first place, the mind of the Church is clearly shown by other authoritative statements; and in the next, it is impossible to found an argument upon the omission of particular parts of the Liturgy at successive reviews; for we find in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., a rubric forbidding the Elevation of the Host, which was omitted in the second—yet no one would pretend that Bucer and others who had a share in this, desired to re-introduce that practice. So again, many passages which contain prayers for the dead, and give more marked encouragement to auricular confession have been omitted in the last review; yet it would scarcely be admitted as evidence by the persons above-mentioned, that the Church desired to forbid either the one or the other. It is far more reasonable to suppose that the abuse against which this exhortation was directed having ceased, it was expunged as no longer needed, in the same way as when the doctrine of Purgatory had been extirpated, the English Church restored the commemoration of Saints departed in the Liturgy, which had been omitted for many years from caution and pious regard for the souls of her children.

An objection to the dismissal of non-communicants has been founded upon the circumstance that there is no rubric ordering them at any particular time to withdraw. This in itself is no sufficient ground, for there is no rubric ordering the congregation either to

assemble at the beginning of divine service, or to depart at its conclusion; and yet it could hardly be deduced from this, that the Church intended persons to come in and out while the prayers were being offered up. It would seem, however, as though the Church intended non-communicants to withdraw after the prayer for "the whole state of CHRIST's Church," since after that come the exhortations to communion, and the rubric concerning the "placing" of those who were about to communicate. "The rubric as to convenient placing, appears to mark the period of the service, at which the separation of communicants from non-communicants ought to take place, and to determine that the portion in which the latter share on occasions of Communion, shall be the same which is appointed to be read when there is no celebration."¹

It would, perhaps, seem more in accordance with the antient rituals for the non-communicants to withdraw before the Invitation, "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent," &c. "For the Priest," we are told, "used to go down to the chancel-door, and with a loud voice and thundering noise, like a crier, lifting his hand on high, mounted up visible to all men, these he inviteth to participate, those he driveth away."² The form of invitation in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, as well as in that of S. James, is the same, "In the fear of God, with Faith draw near."³

But to come to the guidance which the English

¹ How shall we conform to the Liturgy, p. 217.

² Chrysostom Hom. xviii, in Hebr. ³ L'Estrange, p. 311.

Church of this day would seem to give us. Bearing in mind that the practice of the Roman Church is to encourage her members to remain during the celebration as *spectators, not receivers*, what can be more conclusive than this admonition of our own? “The Sacraments were *not* ordained of CHRIST to be *gazed upon*, or to be carried about, but that we should *duly use* them; and in such only as worthily *receive* the same, they have a wholesome effect, or operation;”¹ for it can hardly be believed by any candid person, that the intention of the Church was merely to state an historical fact, which men might themselves have deduced from Scripture,—as that Noah had three sons, or that Pontius Pilate was once the Roman Governor at Jerusalem; and yet to such shifts have persons been reduced who are bent upon forcing the Prayer Book to adopt their views, that this has been gravely advanced.

We next come to the Homilies, which speak in language, if possible, still more unmistakeable:—“And as of old time, God decreed the wondrous benefits of the deliverance of His people, to be kept in memory by the *eating* of the Passover, with His rites and ceremonies; so our loving SAVIOUR hath ordained and established the remembrance of His great mercy expressed in His Passion, in the institution of His Heavenly Supper, where *every one of us must be guests, and not gazers—eaters, and not lookers*—feeding ourselves, and not leaving others to feed for us; that we may live by our own meat, and not perish

¹ Article xxv. x sold more by 12

for hunger, while others devour all. To this His Commandment forceth us, saying—‘Do ye this, Drink ye all of this.’ To this His promise enticeth; ‘This is My Body, which is given for you; this is, My Blood, which is shed for you.’ So then, of necessity, we must be *ourselves partakers* of this table, and *not beholders* of others.”¹

This passage is nearly identical with the one in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. before noticed; which it is allowed would have discouraged the practice at that period. What candid person can have any doubt as to the mind of the English Church, as opposed to the Roman, upon this point?

Strype tells us, that at Canterbury Cathedral “none were suffered to tarry within the chancel but the communicants;”² and Bishop Andrewes, at the consecration of Jesus Chapel, dismissed the non-communicants before the offertory.³

“S. Paul, that he might reform the abuses of the LORD’S Supper, which the Corinthians began even then to corrupt, proposed to them the *institution* of it by CHRIST to follow—‘That, have I delivered to you, which *I received of the LORD.*’ And CHRIST, that He might refute the errors of the Pharisees in another case, sends them up to the beginning: ‘In the beginning it was not so.’”⁴ The warnings in Holy Scripture against tampering with revealed truth, are many and plain. “Thus have ye made the com-

¹ The First Part of the Sermon concerning the Sacrament.

² Strype. Parker, 1831.

³ Sparrow, p. 415. ⁴ Jewel’s Apol. vi. 16.

mandment of GOD of none effect by your tradition,"¹ says our Blessed LORD. "In vain do they worship Me; teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."² "Every plant which My Heavenly FATHER hath not planted, shall be rooted up."³ "It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith *once for all* delivered to the saints."⁴ And in this matter, if we would know what is the will of GOD, the only safe course is to see what He Himself has revealed, and look to the first *institution* for our guidance.

S. Cyprian expresses great indignation against persons in the third century, who introduced novelties in the celebration of Holy Communion, on this express ground, "That they did by human institution change it into that which is *quite different from the Divine institution.*"⁵ And so Origen thinks it a sufficient argument against reservation, to refer to the *institution*:—"The LORD said to them concerning the Bread which He gave to His Disciples, 'Take and eat.' He did not defer it, nor command it to be reserved till to-morrow."⁶ The force of which lies in this—that the *purpose of the institution* was alone to be considered, *and nothing built upon it.* "It is evidently incumbent upon every Christian to use the Sacraments, according to the *design of the original institution.*"⁷ If, then we look for that, we shall find that the Holy Communion was instituted, that our

¹ S. Matt. xv. 6.

² *Ibid.* v. 9.

³ *Ibid.* 13.

⁴ S. Jude iii.

⁵ Ep. 63, ad. Cœc.

⁶ Origen in Lev. Hom. v.

⁷ Bp. Tomline on Art. xxv.

souls might be fed with the Body and Blood of our LORD;¹ and because, "as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do show the LORD's death till He come."² The memorial of the LORD's death, be it observed, is made, not by the consecration or oblation of the Priest only, but by "*eating* this bread and *drinking* this cup;" and so it has been asserted by some ritualists that the Celebrant should receive standing, since his reception is part and parcel of the celebration. "The institution of the Eucharist was—'Take eat,' and 'drink ye all of it; whence it is evident that the Elements were consecrated, that the *persons who were present* might immediately *eat and drink* them."³

"Instead of keeping the Jewish Passover, which was now to be abrogated, Christians were to commemorate 'CHRIST their Passover, who was sacrificed for them.'"⁴ And when our Blessed LORD instituted the Holy Communion, He said, "with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you."⁵ He is Himself called "our Passover."⁶ "The Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world."⁷ "A Lamb as it had been slain."⁸ "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."⁹ "A Lamb without blemish and without spot."¹⁰ "Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world."¹¹ Of whom it was prophecied, "a bone of Him shall

¹ Cf. S. John vi., 1 Cor. xi.

² 1 Cor. xi. 26.

³ Bp. Tomline on Art. xxv.

⁴ *Ibid.* xxviii.

⁵ S. Luke xxii. 15.

⁶ 1 Cor. v. 7.

⁷ S. John i. 29.

⁸ Rev. v. 6. ⁹ Rev. xiii. 8. ¹⁰ Exodus xii. 5. ¹¹ 1 Pet. i. 19, 20.

not be broken,"¹ says S. John, though this was said not of our LORD Himself, but of the Paschal Lamb.² The type then which will teach us of our LORD's Sacrifice, and of the Holy Communion, as showing it till He come, is not the Sacrifice of the Levitical Priesthood, to which He was altogether superior, and of which He was independent,³ but the Passover. Now if we turn to the institution of the Passover, we shall see that there, as at the institution of the LORD's Supper, the command is to *eat*. No benefit was to accrue from standing by, and so joining in it without eating. "The fourteenth day of the second month, at even, they shall keep it, and *eat* it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs; they shall leave none of it unto the morning, nor break any bone of it:"⁴ and "as the Passover was instituted the night before the actual deliverance of the Israelites, so the LORD's Supper was instituted the night before the redemption of man was accomplished by the crucifixion of our Blessed JESUS. It is to be *partaken of by all* who look for remission of sins by the death of CHRIST; we are not only to cherish that hope in our minds, and express it in our devotions, but we are to give an outward proof of our reliance upon the merits of His Passion as the means of our salvation, by *eating that bread and drinking that wine*, which are typical representations of the Body and Blood of CHRIST."⁵

¹ S. John xix. 36. ² Exod. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12.

³ Heb. vii. ⁴ Numbers ix. 11, 12. ⁵ Bp. Tomline on Art. xxviii.

“The benefit whereof we are partakers thereby, is the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of CHRIST, *as our bodies are by the bread and wine.*” “As our bodies cannot be strengthened and refreshed by bread and wine, unless we *eat and drink* it; so neither can our souls be, by the Body and Blood of CHRIST, *unless we actually partake of It*: and again we must then feed upon CHRIST by faith, as the only means whereby we can partake of His Body and Blood, so as to receive strength and nourishment to our souls from that Heavenly Feast.”¹ Our LORD said, “Take *eat—drink* ye all of it—for the remission of sins.”² In no other way, but by eating and drinking, can the Blood shed on the Cross be sacramentally applied to us. S. Augustine speaks of “the Altar from whence that sacrifice is *dispensed*, whereby the hand-writing against us is blotted out.”³ “The Eucharist cannot profit or be applied to any, *but to him who receives.*”⁴

On the other hand, it is to be feared that there is in some persons a lurking notion, unavowed no doubt, but still existing, of sacramental grace apart from reception, by mere attendance—“a notion for which,” it has been well said by one of our greatest living divines, “there is no authority in Scripture, or antiquity.”

It will be at once allowed, that outward symbols or

¹ Bp. Bev. on Freq. Com. ² S. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28.

³ Conf. Lib. ix., c. 13, vol. i., p. 170.

⁴ Archbp. Cranmer's Letters. App. xiv. 1.

means of grace, are only so far efficacious, as they are vehicles of the grace they were instituted to convey. They have no inherent, inseparable qualities, so far as the soul is concerned. Bread can feed the body—it cannot feed the soul. Sacramental Bread feeds the soul, because God has been pleased to act by Its means—to give His Body “under Its form,”—for the purpose. But It is only good for the purpose for which God ordained It; and we cannot say, that because God makes use of bread and wine for the purpose of feeding the soul, that *therefore* He must be present in It for any purpose to which we may please to apply It. For this reason, it has been a perversion of the Sacrament to use It as a charm, or a preservative against shipwreck,—as Pope Alexander VI. carried It about to save himself from being poisoned,—because It was not ordained for that purpose; neither was It “to be gazed upon,” or “worshipped,” but that we should “*duly* use It;”¹—and, for the same reason, when the purpose of Its institution has been fulfilled, the consecrated Bread will get corrupt, like any other bread. It was their jealousy of innovation on the original institution, which, as it roused Cyprian and Origen, so induced the Early Church to guard very carefully against any part of the Sacrament being otherwise used than to be eaten and drunk, in the same way as the Paschal Lamb must all be eaten, or consumed by fire.²

¹ Art. xxv.

² Exod. xii. 10.

S. Cyprian speaks of the feast upon the Paschal sacrifice, when he applies to the Eucharist those words:—"In one house shall it be eaten; ye shall not carry any of the flesh out of doors; the Flesh of CHRIST, and the Holy Thing of the LORD, cannot be carried out of doors."¹

"Let as many sacrifices be offered upon the altar as may suffice for the people; and if any remain, let them not be reserved till to-morrow, but with fear and dread, be consumed by the diligence of the Clerks."²

"If it is proved that any one having received the grace of the LORD's Supper, hath not consumed and eaten it up, let him be anathema."³ "If any one shall not consume the Eucharist received of the Priest, let him be put away as a sacrilegious person."⁴ And Evagrius says, "There was an antient custom at Constantinople, that when many pieces of the undefiled Body of CHRIST were left after Communion, such young youths as went to school, were sent for, and ate Them up;"⁵ or "It was consumed by fire."⁶

One motive which induces persons to remain and worship at the time of the celebration without receiving, is the same which causes the Roman Church, in defiance of antient custom, to *reserve* the consecrated Element. In both cases there is a notion of a special Presence to be worshipped, as distinct from being

¹ De Unit. Eccl., p. 196.

² Pseudo Clement Ep. ii., ad Jacob. ³ Concil. Cæsar-august. Can. 3.

⁴ Concil. Toled. i., c. 14. ⁵ Evag. Hist. Eccl. Lib. iv., c. 35

⁶ Hesych. in Lev. Lib. ii.

received. For this there is no promise or ground in Scripture, though it necessarily results from the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The question is, “whether when the Sacrament is administered, CHRIST be whole *within man only*, or else His Body and Blood be also *externally* seated in the very consecrated elements themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven either to *consubstantiate* and incorporate CHRIST with elements sacramental, or to *transubstantiate*, and change their substance into His.”¹

“Those who supposed that the bread and wine were by consecration changed into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, would naturally fall into superstitious practices concerning them; and accordingly we find that the Papists lift up the Host with the most pompous solemnities; and add, as Archbishop Secker expresses it, idolatrous practice to erroneous belief; worshipping on their knees a bit of bread for the SON of GOD. It is the custom of our Church, to kneel at the Sacrament of the LORD’s Supper; but we do it not to acknowledge any corporal presence of CHRIST, but to worship Him who is *every where present*—the Invisible GOD.”²

“Scripture and the Fathers holding forth so clearly, that whosoever worthily receives the Sacrament of the LORD’s Supper, doth certainly partake of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, the devil thence took occasion to draw men into an opinion, that the bread which is

¹ Hooker Eccl. Pol. v., c. 67, § 2. ² Bp. Tomline on Art. xxviii.

used in that Sacrament, is the very Body that was crucified on the Cross, and the wine after consecration the very Blood that gushed out of His pierced side. The time when this opinion was first broached, was in the days of Gregory the third, Pope of Rome.”¹ “He that saith because our SAVIOUR said ‘This is My Body,’ the bread is therefore changed into His Body, may as well say, that because that Joseph said, ‘the seven good kine are seven years, and the seven good ears are seven years,’ therefore the seven good kine and the seven ears were all changed into seven years; and because that Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, ‘thou art this head of gold,’ therefore Nebuchadnezzar must needs be changed into an head of gold: whereas it is plain, that in Scripture that is often said to *be* a thing, which is only the *sign* of it: as the great God is pleased to explain Himself when He said of circumcision, ‘This is my covenant;’ and in the next verse, ‘And it shall be a sign or token of the covenant betwixt me and you.’ And what sense the Most High explains Himself by in *that* Sacrament, we may well understand Him in *this*; when He said, ‘This is My covenant,’ He tells us what He meant by the phrase, even this is the *sign* of My covenant. So here when CHRIST said, ‘This is My Body,’ according to His own explication of Himself before, it is no more than if he should have said, ‘This is the *sign or token* of My Body;’ and therefore saith

¹ Bp. Bev. on Art. xxviii.

S Augustine, "For if sacraments should not have a certain resemblance of the things whereof they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all, but from this resemblance they often receive the name of the things themselves, therefore as after a certain manner the Sacrament of CHRIST'S Body, is the Body of CHRIST, and the Sacrament of His Blood, is Blood, so the Sacrament of Faith (Baptism) is Faith."¹ So that the words 'This is My Body,' prove no more than that the Bread was the sign or Sacrament of His Body."² "With all certainty and persuasion let us partake of It as of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, for under the *type of bread* His Body is given to thee, and under the *type of wine* His Blood is given to thee, that partaking of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, thou mayest be of one Body and Blood with Him."³

"Is there any thing more expedite, clear, and easy, than that as CHRIST is termed *our life*, because through Him we *obtain life*, so the parts of this sacrament are His Body and Blood, for that they are so to us, who receiving them, receive that by them, which they are termed? The Bread and Cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of His Body and Blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect, is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth;"—"the real presence of CHRIST'S most blessed Body and Blood, is

¹ Aug. ep. ad Bon. xcvi. 9, vol. ii. ² Bp. Bev. on Art. xxviii.

³ Cyril. Hier. catech. Myst. iv. 1.

not therefore to be sought for in the *Sacrament*, but in the *worthy receivers* of the *Sacrament*; and with this the very order of our SAVIOUR'S Words agreeth : —first, 'Take and eat;' then, 'This is My Body which was broken for you:' first, 'Drink ye all of this;' then followeth 'This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of CHRIST, when and where the Bread is His Body, or the cup His Blood, but *only* in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the Sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, *nor do really contain* in themselves that grace which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow. If on all sides it be confessed, that the grace of baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it, although it be neither seated in the water, nor the water changed into it, what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it? The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST. There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith we cannot by this Sacrament be made partakers of His Body and Blood, except they be first contained in the Sacrament, or the Sacrament converted into them." ¹

“Having received bread, and distributed it to His

¹ Hooker Eccl. Pol. V. c. 67, § 5, 6.

disciples, He made it His Body ; saying, ‘ This is My Body ;’ that is, the figure of My Body.”¹

“The LORD did not stick to say, ‘ This is My Body,’ when He gave the *sign* of His Body.”²

“What else but the substance of the wine is seen? It is clear, because the bread and wine are CHRIST’S Body and Blood *figurately*.” And again, “There is nothing more absurd than to take bread for flesh, and to call wine, blood; neither would it be a mystery wherein there is nothing secret and hidden contained. And how shall that be called the very Body or Blood of CHRIST, wherein there is no change known to be made; and if they have endured no change they are nothing else than what they were before.”³

“Understand spiritually what I say unto you : you must not eat that Body which you see, nor drink that Blood which they will shed that crucify Me. I have commended to you a certain Sacrament, being spiritually understood It will quicken you, though It be necessary It should be celebrated visibly, yet It must be understood invisibly.”⁴

“Wherein there is small appearance of likelihood that His meaning should be only to make them Marcionites by inversion, and to teach them, that as Marcion did think CHRIST seemed to be a man but was not, so they contrariwise should believe that

¹ Tertull. advers. Marcion. L. iv., c. 40.

² S. Augustine contra Adimant, c. 12.

³ Bertram de Corp. et Sang. CHRISTI, pp. 514, 515.

⁴ S. Augustine on Psalm xeviii.

CHRIST in truth would so give them, as they thought, His Flesh to eat; but yet lest the horror thereof should offend them, He would not seem to do that He did.”¹

“The sacramental bread and wine being vainly fancied to be changed into the very Body and Blood of CHRIST, it was presently conceived that something more than ordinary honour should be conferred upon It; yea, that It was not only to be eaten, but laid up privately; yea, carried about publicly; lifted up and worshipped too, and that with the same worship which is due to the true and living God: and, therefore have they appointed a certain holy day, too, which they call *Corpus Christi* Day, wherein the Sacramental Bread might be annually carried about, and religiously worshipped. Now we having before proved that this Bread is not the very Body of CHRIST, but bread still, after as well as before consecration, we have overthrown the very foundations of these gross superstitions. It being only upon that account that they perform so much homage and worship to It, because they think It is not what It seems to be, real bread,—but what It doth not seem to be, even the very Body of CHRIST.”²

The Roman doctrine, therefore, involves the practice of reservation and adoration; and because it so involves it, our Church warns us against both the doctrine and its consequence. “Transubstantiation

¹ Hooker Eccl. Pol. V., c. 67, § 9.

² Bp. Bev. on Art. xxviii.

(or the change of the substance of bread and wine,) in the Supper of the LORD, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture—overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of CHRIST is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and the *means* whereby the Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in the Supper, is *Faith*. The Sacrament of the LORD's Supper was not by CHRIST's ordinance *reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.*"¹

"Reservation, elevation, and adoration," are here instanced as corrupt and unlawful practices, resulting from a false view of the Presence of CHRIST in the Sacrament, which is declared to be "*only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*;" while faith in the recipient is necessary for the reception of Him. "The Papists," on the other hand, "carry about the Host, when consecrated, in solemn procession, elevate It with superstitious ceremony, and worship It in the same manner as they would worship God Himself."² The distinction between the English and Roman teaching is here clearly contrasted. The one refers us to the *institution* as our guide—condemns all uses of the Sacrament other than that for which It was first ordained; teaches us that the presence is a Spiritual one, and in the recipient conditional on faith;—the other, maintaining a corporal Presence in elements that have undergone a change, reserves, elevates, and

¹ Art. xxviii.

² Bp Tomline on Art. xxviii.

adores Them. There can be no doubt as to which teaching would lead men to stay to “gaze at and adore,” and not to eat and drink His Body and Blood. The one doctrine involves this practice—the other does not. It is encouraged by the Roman—it is protested against by the English Church; and surely on these questions, where the two are at issue, neither obedience nor love will permit us to ignore, much less to oppose, the teaching of our Spiritual Mother. The Romanist acts consistently enough on his theory:—would that English Churchmen acted more consistently on theirs.

It is well for us to consider whether we are not unconsciously running into the very “superstitions” against which the Church would here guard us, and acting as though the Body of CHRIST, which is in heaven, were present on the altar; for our LORD’s test of “fruits” holds good in this, as in every thing:—fruits are things palpable, and easy to be discerned by the simplest child; they involve no acquaintance with the theory of the circulation of sap, but only an ordinary proportion of common sense, and they are given by our LORD as a test, because every one, however ignorant, can apply it, even though he may not be versed in equivocation, amphibology, and other aids to reflection and discernment. If then we find any doctrine of the Presence in the Eucharist, logically resulting in *fruits* which the English Church condemns, we are bound to reject the teaching in question as false. When therefore we are taught that altogether

apart from the reception, we approach CHRIST at the time of the celebration as we do not at any other time — that He, as it were, comes on earth then, though at other times He is in heaven—we naturally feel that *if* He is thus in the Sacrament brought near to us, it must be of inestimable value to have that Sacrament—involving a Presence which does not exist without It—*always* with us; and so we *reserve It*. Then if He is close to us at that time, and not close to us to the same extent at other times, we *adore* Him, as we do not, and cannot do, at other times; and it has been plainly stated that “such adoration is the natural correlative to such a sense of the Divine Presence;”¹ and it has been called for this reason, the “Adorable Sacrament.”² The *fruits* then of a belief in this localized Presence, are *adoration* and *reservation*. What says our Church? “The *Sacrament* of the LORD’S Supper (*not the outward sign*) was not by CHRIST’S ordinance *reserved*, carried about, lifted up, or *worshipped*.” Whether men “gaze” and “worship,” at the time of the celebration, or an hour afterwards when the celebration is over, is manifestly the same in principle.

Instead then of looking to “the one real Presence (in the Holy Eucharist,) as the centre of adoration,”³ let us rather adore Him Who, while His natural Body is in heaven and *no where else*, does join Himself to His members, “*dwelling in them*,” as S. Paul tells us,

¹ Tracts on Catholic Unity, No. iv. p. 5. ² *Ibid.* No. viii. p. 7.

³ *Ibid.* No. iv. p. 1.

“except they be reprobate,”¹ He has ordained a Sacrament whereby He Who as God is *everywhere*, filling all things, cements His union with us, raising our nature, and “converting us into Himself.”² If we adore Him in the *Body*, it can only be in heaven; for He has not two bodies as the early heretics taught.³ If we would draw near to Him as our LORD GOD, He is *always close* to us,⁴ even *in* those who are His, and we can approach Him no more nearly for worship, in Bread and Wine than at any other time; though in them, according to His institution, He feeds our souls with Himself. “The substance of the Body of CHRIST hath no Presence, neither can have, but only local.”⁵ “The natural Body and Blood of our SAVIOUR CHRIST are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of CHRIST’S natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.”⁶ “CHRIST sitteth at the Right Hand of GOD;”⁷ for “Him must the heavens receive till the time of the restitution of all things; and *when that time is fulfilled*, from that heaven shall He come.”⁸

“Make thou no doubt or question of it, but that the Man CHRIST JESUS, is now in *that very place* from whence He shall come in the same form and substance of flesh which He carried thither, and from which He *hath not taken nature*, but given thereunto, immortality.”⁹

¹ 2 Cor. xiii. 5. ² S. Aug. Conf. vii, § 16. ³ Acts xvii. 27.

⁴ Hooker Eccl. Pol. V. c. 55, § 6.

⁵ Rubric at the end of Communion Service. ⁶ Col. iii. 1.

⁷ Acts iii. 21. ⁸ Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. vii., p. 346.

⁹ S. Augustine Ep. lvii.

“There have been two Presences of the Incarnate Lord upon the earth; the first, His Presence in the flesh, in which He was born, grew, suffered, died, rose, ascended. The other, His Presence in the Spirit, which began ten days after His Ascension, and shall continue till the Judgment.”¹

It has been taught that a belief in the “real Presence,” under the form of bread and wine, involves a real absence at other times.² It involves nothing of the sort; all it does involve, is a belief that our Lord is true to His Institutions, and really *communicates Himself* to us, for the purpose of feeding our souls; and it is only as signifying *nourishment*, that bread and wine are at all appropriate symbols of His Body and Blood. But Presence *for a particular purpose* at one time, does not exclude a *perpetual* Presence at other times, and so we read in Holy Scripture, that “the eyes of the Lord are in *every place* ;”³ God’s promise is, “I will *never* leave thee nor forsake thee :”⁴ “Where two or three are gathered together in His Name, *there* is He in the midst of them :”⁵ In *all places*” where He records His Name, He will come unto us, and will bless us :⁶ Our Lord is with us *“always :”*⁷ not only, nor more nearly, in “breaking of bread,” except for *reception*. In truth there is no need of reserved elements to bring us near to God; *it*

¹ Moberly, Law of Love of God, p. 49.

² Tracts on Catholic Unity, No. iv., p. 3. ³ Prov. xv. 3.

⁴ Heb. xiii. 5. ⁵ S. Matt. xviii. 5.

⁶ Exod. xx. 24. ⁷ S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

is impossible to be apart from Him. “Whither shall I go from Thy Presence?”¹ says the Psalmist; neither heaven nor hell, nor east nor west, nor night nor day can be a hiding-place from Him Who filleth all; when we awake we are *still with Him*.² “Impossible it is that God should withdraw His Presence from anything, because the very substance of God is infinite, He filleth heaven and earth, although He take up no room in either, because His Substance is immaterial, pure, and of us in this world so incomprehensible, that albeit no part of us is *ever absent* from Him Who is perfect whole unto every particular thing, yet His Presence with us we no way discern farther than only that God is present, which partly by reason, and more perfectly by *faith*, we know to be firm and certain.”³

Nor is it true that the Holy Eucharist is “*a special substitute* for that material or carnal Presence, which had done its office when His mortal life was over.”⁴ He Himself tells us what that *substitute* was to be. “It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away, the COMFORTER will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send HIM unto you.”⁵ “He expressly departed in the flesh, because it was necessary for our Christian condition and blessing in the militant Church, that He should come again in the SPIRIT; and accordingly, on the first great Christian Pentecost, He came to abide, the LORD GOD,

¹ Ps. cxxxix. 6. ² *Ibid* 18.

³ Hooker Eccl. Pol. V. c. iv. § 3.

⁴ Tracts on Catholic Unity, No. iv., p. 4. ⁵ S. John xvi. 7.

in the Church, till the Judgment.”¹ We are too apt to lose sight of the Personal indwelling of God the HOLY GHOST in the Church, and in the baptized, which forgetfulness naturally has its influence in leading us to look for the “substitute of CHRIST’S Bodily Presence,” not in His abiding Presence in our own hearts, “coming unto us and making His abode with us ;”² not in the *result*, but in the *means* whereby that end is chiefly to be sought for.

There seems to be a tendency in persons of this class, to ignore the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT, and the intimate relation in which through baptism each Christian stands towards his FATHER. We are constantly thrown back upon the “bondage” and “fear,” and difficulty of access, which was the imperfect condition of the Jews, and which is so strikingly contrasted throughout the Epistles, with the “glorious liberty,” the “boldness,” and the “adoption,” of “the children of God.” So another writer on this side says, “There *alone* (i.e., while the consecrated Elements are on the altar,) can we truly say, ‘LAMB of GOD, that takest away the sins of the world ;’ there *alone* do we, bring down and convey to earth that intercession of our great High Priest, as He stands ever ministering at the heavenly altar.”³ If this means anything, it means that *there alone* can we address our LORD as

¹ Moberly, Law of Love of God, pp. 52, 53.

² S. John xiv. 23.

³ The Right of all the Baptized to be present at the Celebration of of the Holy Eucharist, p. 34.

taking away our sins, and as *actually* mediating for us; but nothing can be more unwise than any attempt to exalt the Sacraments at the expense of truth;—a reaction is the inevitable result. Holy Scripture is express upon the necessity of *constant* prayer for grace and pardon, and the certainty of an answer. Our LORD even condescends to allow us to measure the love of our Heavenly FATHER, by that of an earthly one. “If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, *much more* will your Heavenly FATHER give the HOLY SPIRIT to them that ask Him.”¹ If a Jew could say, “In the evening, and morning, and at noonday will I pray, and that instantly, and He shall hear my voice,”² *much more* can one who has become the child of God, by adoption and grace—“made nigh by the Blood of CHRIST.”³ If the promise in old time was “call upon Me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee,”⁴ and its performance—“They cried unto Thee, and were delivered;”⁵ *much more* is it to us, who have “boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him,”⁶ and because God is our Father, we ever pray “forgive us our sins;”⁷ and the Apostle tells us to “pray *without ceasing* ;”⁸ “pray *everywhere* ;”⁹ “in *everything* by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.”¹⁰ “Let us therefore come *boldly* unto the throne of

¹ S. Luke xi. 13. ² Psalm lv. 18. ³ Eph. ii. 13.

⁴ Ps. xxii. 5. ⁵ Ps. l. 15. ⁶ Eph. iii. 12.

⁷ S. Luke xi. 4. ⁸ 1 Thess. v. 17. ⁹ Tim. ii. 8. ¹⁰ Phil. iv. 6.

grace, that we may obtain mercy.”¹ “Let us draw near in full assurance of faith.”² “Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you.”³ There is *no limitation*, on God’s part, as to *time*, but the very reverse; neither is there any *condition* except our *own sincerity*. “Ye shall seek Me, and *find* Me, when ye shall search for Me with *all your heart* ;”⁴ but, on the other hand, there is a distinct promise of *open reward* to those who pray in their *closet* to their *FATHER* which seeth in secret ;”⁵—for our *need* is the measure of His gifts, Who is ever more ready to hear than we to pray;—He gives as we ask,—He opens as we knock,—we shall find as we seek,⁶—to all who labour, and are heavy laden, He will give rest; and so the Church prays in the Litany, in full assurance of a gracious answer, “LAMB of GOD, that *takest* away the sins of the world, grant us Thy peace.”⁷

Again, the “intercession” of our Lord is *perpetual*, and by no means confined to the time of the Celebration. “He *ever liveth*,” says S. Paul, “to *make intercession for us* ;”⁸ and this intercession is exercised *as often as we sin*. “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the FATHER ;”⁹ and so boundless is the stream of mercy, that S. Paul thought it needful to warn his converts not to “continue in sin that grace might abound.”⁹ Who shall say “here alone,”

¹ Heb. iv. 16.² Heb. x. 22.³ S. James iv. 8.⁴ Jer. xxix. 13.⁵ S. Matt. vi. 6.⁶ S. Luke xi. 9.⁷ Heb. vii. 25.⁸ 1 John ii. 1.⁹ Rom. vi. 1.

or "there alone," of Him Whose Spirit bloweth where It listeth, and thou canst not tell whence It cometh, or whither It goeth?

As in the time of S. Paul, so now, experience shows us that men have always desired "to be under the law."¹ It is so much easier to fill the mind with the thought of outward observances, important as they are, than to have "the answer of a good conscience towards God."² It withdraws the attention from the spiritual life, and from true conversion of the heart and whole being to God, fixing it upon external truths, which because they are in their measure true, are therefore,—if we take them out of their proportion,—the more dangerous. This is the case alike with Priests and people; but in addition to this, there is always a danger that the former will be tempted unconsciously to "magnify their office" in a different sense from S. Paul; and so it comes to pass that "craft," as applied to Priests alone of all the callings of life, has come to signify, not skill in the performance of their work, but the exercise of tyranny and imposture over men's bodies and over their souls.

S. Paul tells us that "faith is the *substance* of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things not seen;"³ and "feebleness of faith in the Unseen, exhibits itself in continual craving after *visible* objects of worship: the Invisible and Spiritual God, (for the very reason that He is Invisible and Spiritual,) seems difficult, and

¹ Gal. iv. 21.

² 1 Pet. iii. 21.

³ Heb. xi. 1.

distant of approach. Minds of feeble texture in spiritual things, desirous to obey the first law by *having*—that is, believing and worshipping in piety,—the true God, sank down in the attempt to maintain a constant sense of His power, and a continual reliance on His protection, to let loose, as it were, their prayers into the air, without having some representative figure or emblem, at the least, at which to point them. All this was too difficult a task for a feeble faith in things invisible and spiritual. They felt they should be happier, better, more pious, and safer, if they might but represent to themselves their Invisible and Undoubted God, under some visible and *local* symbol, in *presence* of which their faith should not faint.

As piety, therefore, is the heart of the first law, so is *spiritual faith in the Unseen*, the heart of the second. It is the very trial and proof of the Christian to realize Him by holy faith as *spiritually present* in the Church, in her members, her Ministers, her Sacraments, her assemblies of prayer, her preachings, though our eyes cannot see Him. Our faith, even as we are Christian people worshipping the God Incarnate, is put upon a trial not wholly dissimilar to that of the Jews. For while they were called upon to worship the Invisible God, and to address to Him, without image or symbol, the strong brave prayers of spiritual faith in the Unseen, we are called upon to recognize and worship CHRIST, whose natural Body is absent from us in heaven, but who is invisibly, yet most truly and sacredly present in the Spirit, in the

Church. Sight, *the bodily sense of sight*, may not assist us to point, or direct our worship, any more than it might assist them. We must launch our prayers in the same strength of faith in the Unseen, at Him Who is surely and *always* near us, and willing to hear.

To the worshipping Christian, CHRIST is as *invisible*, as *omnipresent*, as much to be recognized and addressed by spiritual faith, as JEHOVAH was to the worshipping Jew. To *localize* Him into picture or image, for purposes of worship, is to *forget His omnipresence* in the Church; to depict His Human Body for purposes of worship, is to forget that His Presence upon the earth is now spiritual. To make a picture, or image, as a help of imagination, or an object of address in worship, is to attempt to overrule the counsel of God, in withdrawing the visible Body of the Lord from the earth, and to bring forcibly back, in obedience to the feeble cravings of unfaithfulness, that, the removal of which we have been expressly taught is expedient for us.

While, then, we keep clearly before us the truth that our LORD's Natural Body is in heaven, and "sitteth at the Right Hand of God the FATHER ALMIGHTY," where He can be approached by faith alone; still it is also true, and because true, our great consolation, that "His very Body, not naturally, but supernaturally, not corporeally, but spiritually, is amongst us, and will remain with us *always*." And while we reject all notions of a corporal or material

Moberly, Law of Love of God, c. ii. *Ibid.*

Presence in the Holy Communion, or *localize* that which is *omnipresent*, let us also with all certainty and gratitude believe—"first, that this Sacrament is a true and real participation of CHRIST, Who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire Person, *as a mystical Head*, unto every soul that receiveth Him; and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate, or unite himself unto CHRIST, as a *mystical member of Him*, yea, of them also, whom He acknowledgeth to be His Own. Secondly, that to whom the Person of CHRIST is thus communicated, to them He giveth by the same Sacrament His Holy Spirit, to sanctify them as It sanctifieth Him, Who is their head. Thirdly, that what *merit, force, or virtue soever there is in His Sacrificed Body and Blood*, we freely, fully, and wholly have it by this Sacrament. Fourthly, that *the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness; from death and corruption, to immortality and life. Fifthly, that because the Sacrament being of Itself but a corruptible and earthly creature, must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of His glorious power*, Who is able and will bring to pass, that the bread and the cup, which He giveth us, shall be truly the thing He promiseth."

"This hallowed food, through concurrence of Divine Power, is in verity and truth, unto *faithful receivers*, instrumentally, a cause of that mystical

participation, whereby as He makes Himself wholly ours, so He gives us in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as His Sacrificed Body can yield, and as our souls do presently need; this is to us and in us His Body.”

“The very letter of the Word of CHRIST giveth plain security that these mysteries, do as nails, fasten us to His very Cross; that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the Blood of His gored Side; in the wounds of our REDEEMER we there dip our tongues; we are dyed red, both within and without; our hunger is satisfied, and our thirst for ever quenched.”¹

As regards the benefit to be derived, not from the reception of the holy mysteries, but from attendance at the celebration,—and so from reservation,—“I shall wish the maintainers of the reservation and adoration of the Sacrament, to consider these things:—First, that that doctrine is contrary to CHRIST’S institution, for He said expressly, ‘Take, eat; not take and reserve It,’ nor ‘take and carry It about,’ nor ‘take and worship It;’ but ‘Take and eat, this is My Body.’ Secondly, that it quite overthroweth the nature of the Sacrament; for, according to Augustine’s rule, ‘If Sacraments have not a certain resemblance of the things whereof they are Sacraments, they are no Sacraments at all.’ Now wherein is there any resemblance betwixt the Body of CHRIST and bread, but only in the eating? Even because the one re-

¹ Hooker Eccl. Pol. V., c. 67.

ceived by faith, nourisheth and preserveth the spiritual, as the other received into the stomach, doth the natural life. The bread itself hath no resemblance at all of His Body, *neither hath the bread as reserved, or carried about, or worshipped, any such resemblance—*all the resemblance it hath is in its *feeding* the body, as CHRIST doth the soul. Whensoever bread is not eaten, but reserved or carried about, though it may have its nourishing faculty, yet it doth not *exert* any such virtue; and by consequence *loseth* its resemblance to His Body, *and so ceases to be sacramental bread any longer*; and therefore they must know the bread they reserve and carry about, is *not the Body of CHRIST, nor hath any relation to it, because they reserve and carry it about, and do not eat it.*"¹

I? "A sacramental unity of CHRIST's Body and Blood [there cannot be, without the commemoration of His Death and Passion, because CHRIST *never promised* His mysterious yet real presence, *but in reference to such commemoration.* Nor can there be a true commemoration without the body and blood exhibited and *participated.*"²

No one doubts but that in Baptism the HOLY SPIRIT descends, and sanctifies the water to the mystical washing away of sin, because the Sacrament was instituted that men might by It be "born again;"³ but who would ever think that the HOLY SPIRIT was more really present for the purpose of being wor-

¹ Bp. Bev. on Art. xxviii.

² L'Estrange, p. 324.

³ S. John iii. 5.

shipped during the baptismal service, than at any other time? Who would consider himself *brought nearer* to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity then, than he is during his private devotions. Yet the presence in one Sacrament *for its purpose* is as "real" as in the other, and the deduction as reasonable in the one as in the other.

The notion of a *propitiatory* sacrifice in the Holy Communion, is probably at the root of the desire of persons to be present at that time, independently of all idea of receiving. The legitimate result of this belief, was the celebration of the Eucharist by the Priest alone, for the sins of the living and the dead, often for some one person in particular. This was called a "solitary mass," and came into general use about the eighth century,¹ following close upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation—of which it is a legitimate result.

That the Holy Communion is a "propitiatory sacrifice," is plainly affirmed by the advocates of "gazing." One of them writes—"He is present to be offered up a sacrifice by the Priest; in which, on behalf of the whole Church, are impleaded His merits and death *for the remission of sins*, and all other benefits of His Passion. In It, our Blessed Lord's *own Body and Blood really present* are offered up."²

So, again—"And, forasmuch, as in this Divine Sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, *that same* CHRIST is contained and *immolated* in an unbloody

¹ Spanheim's Eccl. Annals, pp. 328, 352.

² Tracts on Cath. Unity, No. viii., p. 7.

manner, Who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the Altar of the Cross: the holy Synod teaches that this sacrifice is truly *propitiatory*, and that by means thereof this is effected, that we obtain mercy.”¹

On the other hand, the Church of England maintains that “the offering of CHRIST *once made*, is that *perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction* for all the sins of the world, both original and actual; and there is *none other satisfaction* for sin but *that alone*. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which, it was commonly said, that the *Priest did offer* CHRIST for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were *blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits*.”²

The identity of theology, and even expression, between the doctors of Trent, and those amongst ourselves who encourage the practice of “hearing Mass,” is, perhaps, more remarkable than astonishing. Few will fail to see the entire diversity of both from the teaching of the Church of England, save those, who, as Hooker says of Bellarmine, “delight to run a course by themselves, where colourable shifts of wit will but make the way passable.”

It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary to add, that Holy Scripture teaches us that we are made partakers of this “sacrifice of CHRIST *once made*,”—when we worthily “eat and drink” the Sacramental Elements. “Drink ye all of It, for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission

¹ Council of Trent, Session xxii., chap. 2. ² Art. xxxi.

of sins.”¹ “I ought always to *receive* that which is shed for the remission of sins, that my sins may always be forgiven me,” says S. Ambrose.²

There was, indeed, a time when sacrifices were offered “year by year continually;” when, *because* “they could not make the comers thereunto perfect;” “they did not cease to be offered;” but that was under the Law. Now, however, Christians are sanctified “through the offering of the Body of CHRIST *once for all*—for by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;” and this being so, there is now “*no more offering for sin* ;” but our Blessed Lord having taken away the veil that kept us from the presence of God, and Himself entered in for ever, bids us “having *boldness* to enter into the holiest by the Blood of JESUS, draw near with a true heart, in *full assurance of faith*.”³ Any offering or sacrifice for sin, would now be not only useless, but an indignity to “the Blood of the Covenant,” which was shed on the Cross; because the Covenant is this,—“their sins and iniquities *will I remember no more*. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.” To offer any more, would be to doubt the “remission;” i.e., to judaize. In no sense is the sacrifice of the Altar a repetition of the sacrifice of the Cross; since “such an High Priest became us who *needeth not daily*, as those High Priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the

¹ S. Matt. xxvi. 27, 28. ² De Sacrament. iv. 6, p. 132.

³ Heb. x.

people's; for this He did *once*, when He offered up Himself."

"CHRIST, with once offering, hath made perfect for ever them that be sanctified, putting their sins clean out of God's remembrance; and where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.² CHRIST's sacrifice once offered, was sufficient for ever more. There never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor never shall be. Another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God; but is made of them *that be reconciled by CHRIST*, to testify our duties unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto Him; and therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving. The first kind of sacrifice CHRIST offered to God for us; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by CHRIST. And by the first kind of sacrifice, CHRIST offered also us unto His FATHER; and by the second, we offer ourselves, and all that we have unto Him and His FATHER;—and this sacrifice generally is our whole obedience unto God, in keeping His Laws and Commandments—of which manner of sacrifice speaketh the prophet David, saying— 'A sacrifice to God is a contrite heart.'³ And S. Peter saith of all Christian people, that they be an holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by JESUS CHRIST.⁴ And S. Paul saith, that 'alway we offer unto God a sacrifice of laud and praise by JESUS CHRIST.'⁵

¹ Heb. vii. 27. ² Heb. x. x. 10

³ Ps. 50.

⁴ 1 Pet. ii.

⁵ Heb. xiii. 15.

But now to speak somewhat more largely of the priesthood and sacrifice of CHRIST. He was such an High Bishop, that He once offering Himself, was sufficient by one effusion of His Blood, to abolish sin unto the world's end. He was so perfect a Priest, that by one oblation He purged an infinite heap of sins, leaving an easy and a ready remedy for all sinners, that His one sacrifice should suffice for many years unto all men that would not show themselves unworthy. So that now we may look for none other Priest nor sacrifice to take away our sins, but only Him and His sacrifice. Thus the Scripture teacheth, that if CHRIST had made any oblation for sin more than once, He should have died more than once; forasmuch as there is none oblation and sacrifice for sin, but only His death—and now there is no more oblation for sin, seeing that by Him our sins are remitted and our consciences quieted.

Now by these foresaid things may every man easily perceive, that the offering of the Priest in the mass, or the appointing of His ministration at His pleasure, to them that be quick or dead, is contrary to the doctrine of the gospel, and injurious to the sacrifice of CHRIST; wherefore it is an abominable blasphemy to affirm, that the Church hath need of any such sacrifice, as who should say, that CHRIST's sacrifice were not sufficient for the remission of our sins, or else that His sacrifice should hang upon the sacrifice of a Priest; and if we put the oblation of the Priest in the stead of the oblation of CHRIST, *refusing to receive the*

Sacrament of His Body and Blood ourselves as He ordained, and trusting to have remission of our sins by the sacrifice of the Priest in the mass, we do not only injury to CHRIST, but also commit most detestable idolatry. The prophet Malachi saying that 'every where should be offered unto God a pure sacrifice and oblation,'¹ spake no words of the Mass, nor of any oblation propitiatory to be made by the Priests: but he spake of the oblation of all faithful people in what place soever they be, which offer unto God with pure hearts and minds, sacrifices of laud and praise. They therefore, which gather of the doctors, that the mass is a sacrifice for the remission of sin, do them most grievous injury and wrong, most falsely belying them, for these monstrous things were never seen nor known of the Old and Primitive Church, nor were there then in our Church many masses every day; but upon certain days there was a common table of the LORD's Supper, where a number of people did together receive the Body and Blood of the LORD; nor the holy Fathers of the Old Church would not have suffered such ungodly and wicked abuses of the LORD's Supper. Therefore when they called the mass or supper of the LORD, a sacrifice, they meant it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgivings, (and so as well the people as the Priest do sacrifice,) or else that it was a remembrance of the very true propitiatory sacrifice of CHRIST, but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for

¹ Mal. i. 11.

sin, and application by the Priest to quick and dead." ¹ "This is only a *memorial*, which the Lord hath delivered to us *instead of a sacrifice*." ² And as the first Passover was *propitiatory*, ³ while those that followed were only *commemorative* of the first, ⁴ so is the "Lord's Supper" our *commemorative feast* upon the sacrifice of the Cross. "CHRIST *once* gave Himself to God for us, and now gives Himself to us, to *feast upon, not to sacrifice*; and our LORD'S Sacrifice being a perpetual one, we participate in it sometimes symbolically, as in the *two Sacraments*, and at other times without symbols, by *faith* only, and a good life. As the Jews literally feasted upon the *typical* sacrifices, so Christians spiritually feast upon the Body and Blood of CHRIST, the true and grand sacrifice. Therefore CHRIST'S Sacrifice is our sacrifice, but in the passive sense, for us to *partake of*, not to *give to* God." ⁵

"Justin Martyr expressly says, that Christians have no other sacrifice but prayers and praises." ⁶ And passages to the same effect are found in the works of Athenagoras, Minutius Felix, Origen, Tertullian, Clement, and Cyril, both of Alexandria, and Arnobius; and in none of the antient rituals is the Eucharist considered as an offering of CHRIST to God." ⁷ As our own Communion Service speaks of

¹ Archbp. Cranmer, Of the Oblation and Sacrifice of CHRIST.

² Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. i. 10.

³ Exod. xii. 23. ⁴ *Ibid.* 25, 26, 27. ⁵ Waterland's Charge, 1740, ii.

⁶ Apol. ii. ⁷ Bp. Tomline on Art. xxxi.

a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" and of an offering of "ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice."

"What," says S. Austin, "have we therefore nothing to offer? Shall we so come before God? So hope to appease Him? By all means offer: you have *within* you what you are to offer. Look not *abroad* for *frankincense*, but say, 'In me are Thy *sacrifices of praise*, O God, which I am to render Thee.' The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit."¹

"But to clear the matter up yet further, so as to cut off all evasive pretences or reserves, it is worth noting, that he (Justin Martyr) distinctly points out what is to be offered to man and what to God, in the Eucharist: all the material part, all that God gives for *nutriment*, is to be *offered to ourselves*, and to the needy, and to God are to be sent up *hymns and praises*.² What then is offered up to God? Nothing? Yes! thanks, praises, hymns, and the like—that is God's tribute, that is a sacrifice fit for Him, and worthy of Him."³

Let us then be careful, how even insensibly we allow ourselves to indulge in "oppositions of science, falsely so called;"⁴ drawing inferences which may seem logical, but are pretty sure to be erroneous, from the mysteries of religion. Let us be careful that we do not, from self-will or presumption, or impatience of doubtfulness, where God has not

¹ In Ps. 1, Tom. iv., p. 473.

² Apol. i., p. 19.

³ Waterland's Charge, 1740, v.

⁴ 1 Tim. vi. 20.

defined, “wrest this mystery to ignoble senses, or to evil events, or to *dangerous propositions* ;”¹ and how “when He has not revealed to us the mode or conditions of His presence, we make it the subject of argument, as if it were either governed by the law, or involved the consequences of a material presence. We have no right to stop after the Prayer of Consecration, or at any other intermediate point, in that which by the Lord’s appointment, is one undivided whole, and to argue that at that time, that Divine presence must have been granted, which is promised only to the act of *duly giving and receiving*, and not to any of its several parts.”² “What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”³ And while as humble Christians we refrain from all speculations as to the mode of that mysterious Presence, the reality of which we inculcate, but which, being unrevealed, is far beyond the grasp of any,—let us as honest members of the English Church, avoid every specific form of erroneous teaching which she either explicitly or by implication condemns; and shrink from exercising our “curious and subtile wits” upon that heavenly food which is given for satisfying our empty souls.

The surest consolation is in His *ever abiding* presence—Who dwells with him who is of a contrite spirit—Who takes up His abode with those that love Him, and keep His words—Who renews each indi-

¹ Bp. Jer. Taylor, vol. xv. p. 448.

² Bp. of Oxford’s Charge, 1854.

³ S. Matt. xix. 6.

vidual soul of them that are His; giving them by His Spirit the gift of a true and living faith in Him. "May ALMIGHTY GOD," as good Archbishop Cranmer prayed, "give this light of faith to every man, that he may trust to have remission of his sins, by the merit only of the death and blood of CHRIST, and that by his own faith, every man may apply the same unto himself."¹

Let us then, dwell upon the delights of that *personal communion* with our LORD, which is the precious privilege of all, in whose hearts His love is shed abroad through the HOLY GHOST working in them, drawing them day by day nearer to Himself,—let us live in the light of His *ever present* love, Who knows His sheep and is known of His,² Who numbers the hairs of our heads,³ and knows us by name,⁴—Who counts them more blessed than the virgin womb that bare Him, "Who hear the Word of God and keep it,"⁵ vouchsafing them a dearer place in His sacred Heart, than even mother, sister, or brother.⁶ Let us not rest till we obtain to this grace—"the *knowledge* of our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST"⁷—to a deep conviction of our individual sinfulness—to a real value in our own experience for the work of His Atonement;—let us never rest till we have sought and *found* Him as *our own* REDEEMER. Then, and not till then, shall we be satisfied with the

¹ Of the Oblation and Sacrifice of CHRIST.

² John x. 14. ³ Matt. x. 30. ⁴ Exodus xxxiii. 12.

⁵ Luke xi. 27, 28. ⁶ Matt. xii. 46. ⁷ 2 Peter iii. 18.

fulness of His Presence, not *without* us only, but *within*.

Inexpressible as are the blessings—infinite as is the grace which is conveyed in the Sacraments,—let us ever bear in mind that It is an *abiding*, not a transitory one: “God is present, not for a transitory visit, but by an *eternal abiding*.”¹ For “what eating is to the flesh, that is *faith* to the soul,” says S. Cyprian.² “How,” says S. Augustine, shall I send up my hand to heaven, to lay hold upon Him sitting there? “Send thy *faith*, and thou hast laid hold on Him.”³ “This, therefore, is to eat the food that doth not perish, but endureth unto life eternal; why dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly? *Believe, and thou hast eaten*.”⁴

JESUS is *ever* in a heart where *faith* is whole; He teaches there,—He watches there,—He rejoices there,—and there He defends.”⁵

¹ S. Aug. Hom. lvi. on S. John, § 4.

² De Cœna. Dom., p. 41.

³ On S. John Tr. l.

⁴ *Ibid.* Tr. xxv.

⁵ S. Ambrose, Sermon. ii.





